

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action issued on June 15, 2005. By this response, claims 1 and 7 are amended. No new matter is added. Claim 3 is cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are now active for examination. The amendments place the application in better form for allowance. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

The Office Action dated June 15, 2005 rejected claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 4,911,594). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fisher in view of Frederick (U.S. Patent No. 3,203,302). Claim 6 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fisher. The Examiner indicated that claim 3 describes patentable subject matter. Claim 7 was further objected to for including a typographical error.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are overcome and the objections are addressed in view of the amendments and/or remarks presented herein.

The Rejections of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 Are Traversed

The Office Action objected to claim 3 for depending from a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that claim 3 describes patentable subject matter over the documents of record.

By this Response, independent claims 1 and 7 are amended to include the subject matter described in claim 3 and additional revisions to improve wording. Since the Office Action already acknowledged that the subject matter described in claim 3 is patentable over the documents of record, it is submit that claims 1 and 7 also are patentable over the documents of record by incorporating the allowable subject matter described in claim 3. The amendments place the

application in better form for allowance. Entry of the amendments and favorable reconsideration of claims 1 and 7 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Since claim 1, as amended, is patentable over documents of record, claims 2, 4 and 6 should be patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1, as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 2, 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

The Objection to Claim 7 Is Addressed.

The Office Action objected to claim 7 for including a typographical error. Specifically, the Examiner suggested changing the description “from on the shank of the bolt” to “formed on the shank of the bolt.” By this Response, claim 7 is amended as suggested by the Examiner. It is believed that claim 7 is now in appropriate form.

The Objection to Claim 3 Is Moot

By this response, claim 3 is cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, the objection to claim 3 is now moot.

Conclusions

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ representatives listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Recognized under 37 CFR §10.9(b)

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 WC:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 16, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**